arXiv:1302.6003v3 [quant-ph] 5 Mar 2013

Quantum logic and weak values

Riuji Mochizuki*
Laboratory of Physics, Tokyo Dental College,
Tokyo, Japan

March 6, 2013

Abstract

In this paper we study weak values and weak measurement from a quantum-logical viewpoint. We examine the validity of counter-factual interpretation of Hardy's paradox in terms of weak values and show that it is not evaluated by means of weak measurement. It is also shown that strange weak values may appear only if they are not (conditional) probabilities and that noncommuting observables can not be measured simultaneously even by weak measurement.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ta, 03.65.Ud, 03.65.Ca

1 Introduction

Since Aharonov et al.[1][2][3] developed the concept of weak measurement and weak values, they have attracted great attention. In weak measurement, which is different from conventional von Neumann-type measurement[4], the interaction between an observed system and a probe is considered to give no effect on the observed system by taking its weak coupling limit. Some authors[5][6] claim that noncommuting observables can be measured simultaneously by weak measurement and relations to Bell's inequality[7] are discussed.

Weak measurement enables us to select both an initial state and a final state. A weak value of an operator $\hat{A}$ for an initial state $|\Phi\rangle$ and a final state $|\Psi\rangle$ is defined as

$$\langle\hat{A}\rangle_{\Psi\Phi} \equiv \frac{\langle\Psi|\hat{A}|\Phi\rangle}{\langle\Psi|\Phi\rangle}. \tag{1}$$

Recently, weak values are attracting attention not only as a measured value by weak measurement but also due to its physical meaning in itself[8]. For example, counter-factual statements on Hardy's paradox[9] are interpreted in terms of weak values[10], and predictions about them are experimentally checked[11][12][13]. There, however, appears "probability -1". Moreover, weak values may become complex. Such strange weak values are discussed by many authors[14][15][8][16], but the condition in which they appear has not been clarified yet.

In this paper, we study weak values from a quantum-logical viewpoint to clarify what they are.

*E-mail: rjmochi@tdc.ac.jp

Moreover, we investigate the validity of counter-factual statements on Hardy's paradox in terms of weak values. The followings are concluded: (i) Weak value (1) with a projection operator $\hat{A}$ is a (conditional) probability if and only if $[|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|, \hat{A}] = 0$ or $[|\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|, \hat{A}] = 0$ or $[|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|, |\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|] = 0$. (ii) Strange values (complex numbers and real numbers except between 0 and 1) do not appear if the weak value is a (conditional) probability. (iii) We can not evaluate the validity of counter-factual statements on Hardy's paradox by means of weak measurement. (iv) Whether the product of two observables may be regarded as an observable in practical measurement is determined by comparing the weak value of their commutator with the error of the measurement. v)We can not measure noncommuting observables even by weak measurement.

In the second section, we investigate weak values of projection operators and present conditions where they are regarded as conditional probabilities. Hardy's paradox is examined in the third section. Its counter-factual interpretation in terms of weak values and experiments which have proven them are discussed there. Our conclusion is in the last section.

2 What are weak values?

We examine an expectation value $\langle\Phi|\hat{A}|\Phi\rangle$ of an observable $\hat{A}$ for a state vector $|\Phi\rangle$. Let $|\psi_j\rangle$ be eigenvectors corresponding to eigenvalues $\psi_j,\ j = 1, 2, \cdots$ of an observable $\hat{\Psi}$, respectively. Inserting $1 = \sum_j |\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j|$ and assuming $\langle\psi_j|\Phi\rangle \neq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\Phi|\hat{A}|\Phi\rangle &= \sum_j \langle\Phi|\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j|\hat{A}|\Phi\rangle \\ &= \sum_j |\langle\Phi|\psi_j\rangle|^2 \frac{\langle\psi_j|\hat{A}|\Phi\rangle}{\langle\psi_j|\Phi\rangle} \qquad (2) \\ &= \sum_j \Pr(\psi_j|\Phi)\langle\hat{A}\rangle_{\psi_j\Phi},\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Pr(\psi_j|\Phi) = |\langle\Phi|\psi_j\rangle|^2$$

is the probability that a state $|\psi_j\rangle$ is found in a state $|\Phi\rangle$. Thus, we can interpret an expectation value $\langle\Phi|\hat{A}|\Phi\rangle$ as a statistical average of weak values $\langle\hat{A}\rangle_{\Psi_j\Phi}$, so that they are treated by many authors as expectation values of $\hat{A}$ between an initial state $|\Phi\rangle$ and final states $|\psi_j\rangle,\ j = 1, 2, \cdots$. As shown below, however, it is not decided by means of (2) whether weak values are always interpreted as probabilities or expectation values. In other words, what weak values are has not been clarified yet.

We write a proposition "an eigenvalue a_i is obtained when an observable $\hat{A}$ is measured" as $A(a_i)$ and its corresponding projection operator as $\hat{A}_i = |a_i\rangle\langle a_i|$. Similarly we define a proposition $\Psi(\psi_j)$ and a projection operator $\hat{\Psi}_j = |\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j|$. A set of such propositions constitute a σ-complete orthomodular lattice[17][18] and so do a set of such projection operators.

Firstly, let $\hat{A}$ in (2) be a projection operator $\hat{A}_i = |a_i\rangle\langle a_i|$. Then,

$$\langle\Phi|\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j|a_i\rangle\langle a_i|\Phi\rangle = \Pr(\psi_j|\Phi)\langle\hat{A}_i\rangle_{\psi_j,\Phi}. \qquad (3)$$

A necessary and sufficient condition in which an operator $\hat{\Psi}_j\hat{A}_i$ is a projection operator is $[\hat{\Psi}_j, \hat{A}_i] = 0$. If and only if it is satisfied, $\hat{\Psi}_j\hat{A}_i$ corresponds to a proposition $\Psi(\psi_j)\wedge A(a_i)$ and the left-hand side of (3) is its probability for $|\Phi\rangle$, i.e. the probability of finding $|\psi_j\rangle$ *and* $|a_i\rangle$ in $|\Phi\rangle$. Thus, the weak value $\langle\hat{A}\rangle_{\psi_j,\Phi}$ is the conditional probability of finding $|a_i\rangle$ in $|\Phi\rangle$ when $|\psi_j\rangle$ is found in $|\Phi\rangle$ if and only if $[\hat{\Psi}_j, \hat{A}_i] = 0$. Then

$$0 \leq \langle\Phi|\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j|a_i\rangle\langle a_i|\Phi\rangle \leq \Pr(\psi_j) \leq 1,$$

so that

$$0 \leq \langle\hat{A}_i\rangle_{\psi_j\Phi} \leq 1. \qquad (4)$$

As shown later, weak values are actually 0 or 1 in such a case. We may interchange $|\psi_j\rangle$ and $|\Phi\rangle$ in the above discussion. If $|\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|$ and $\hat{\Psi}_j$ commute, $\langle\hat{A}\rangle_{\psi_j\Phi}$ is the probability of finding $|a_i\rangle$ in $|\Phi\rangle$ (or in $|\psi_j\rangle$).

If $[\hat{\Psi}_j, \hat{A}] \neq 0$, the projection operator corresponding to a proposition $\Psi(\psi_j) \wedge A(a_i)$ is $\lim_{n\to\infty}(\hat{\Psi}_j\hat{A}_i)^n$[17]. Instead, if we construct, for example, a hermitian operator $\hat{H} \equiv \hat{A}\hat{\Psi}\hat{A}$ and a projection operator $\hat{H}_k \equiv |h_k\rangle\langle h_k|$, where $\hat{H}|h_k\rangle = h_k|h_k\rangle$, a proposition corresponding to $\hat{H}_k$ exists. Nevertheless, this proposition is not expressed by means of

$\Psi(\psi_j)$s and/or $A(a_i)$s. On the other hand, $\hat{\Psi}_j\hat{A}_i$ is not a projection operator or does not correspond to any propositions. Thus, if any two of $\hat{\Psi}_j$, $\hat{A}_i$ and $|\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|$ do not commute, we cannot interpret the left-hand side of (3) as a probability or the right-hand side of (2) as a sum of probabilities. In such cases, therefore, $\langle\hat{A}_i\rangle_{\psi_j\Phi}$ is not a conditional probability of finding $|a_i\rangle$ in $|\Phi\rangle$ when $|\psi_j\rangle$ is found in $|\Phi\rangle$,

In order to corroborate the above conclusion, we reexamine $\langle\Phi|\hat{A}|\Phi\rangle$. If $\hat{A}=\hat{A}_i$,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\Phi|\hat{A}_i|\Phi\rangle &= \langle\Phi|\hat{A}_i\hat{A}_i|\Phi\rangle \\ &= \sum_j \langle\Phi|\hat{A}_i\hat{\Psi}_j\hat{A}_i|\Phi\rangle \\ &= \sum_j \Pr(\psi_j|\Phi)|\langle\hat{A}_i\rangle_{\psi_j\Phi}|^2.\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

$\langle\Phi|\hat{A}_i\hat{\Psi}_j\hat{A}_i|\Phi\rangle = \langle\Phi|\hat{\Psi}_j\hat{A}_i|\Phi\rangle$, if $\hat{A}_i$ and $\hat{\Psi}_j$ commute. Then, comparing (5) with (2), $\langle\hat{A}_i\rangle_{\psi_j\Phi}=0$ or 1. Conversely, if $\langle\hat{A}_i\rangle_{\psi_j\Phi}\neq|\langle\hat{A}_i\rangle_{\psi_j\Phi}|^2$, it is obvious that at least either of the following two statements is false:"$\langle\hat{A}_i\rangle_{\psi_j\Phi}$ is an expectation value of $\hat{A}_i$ between an initial state $|\Phi\rangle$ and a final state $|\psi_j\rangle$." "$|\langle\hat{A}_i\rangle_{\psi_j\Phi}|^2$ is an expectation value of $\hat{A}_i$ between an initial state $|\Phi\rangle$ and a final state $|\psi_j\rangle$." We know both of them are false if the operators do not commute.

We comment on strange weak values. We divide $\langle\Phi|\hat{\Psi}_j\hat{A}_i|\Phi\rangle$ up into a real part and an imaginary part:

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\Phi|\hat{\Psi}_j\hat{A}_i|\Phi\rangle =& \langle\Phi|\frac{1}{2}(\hat{\Psi}_j\hat{A}_i+\hat{A}_i\hat{\Psi}_j)|\Phi\rangle \\ &+\langle\Phi|\frac{1}{2}[\hat{\Psi}_j,\hat{A}_i]|\Phi\rangle.\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Then, a weak value

$$\langle\hat{A}\rangle_{j\Phi}=\frac{\langle\Phi|\hat{\Psi}_j\hat{A}_i|\Phi\rangle}{\Pr(\psi_j|\Phi)} \tag{7}$$

is a complex number if $\langle\Phi|[\hat{\Psi}_j,\hat{A}_i]|\Phi\rangle\neq 0$. On the other hand, it becomes real if $\langle\Phi|[\hat{\Psi}_j,\hat{A}_i]|\Phi\rangle=0$. Here we should pay attention to the fact that $\langle|[\hat{\Psi}_j,\hat{A}_i]|\rangle=0$ for some states is not a sufficient condition for $[\hat{\Psi}_j,\hat{A}_i]=0$, i.e. $\hat{\Psi}_j\hat{A}_i$ possessing a corresponding proposition. If $\langle\Phi|[\hat{\Psi}_j,\hat{A}_i]|\Phi\rangle=0$ and any pair of $\hat{\Psi}_j$, $\hat{A}_i$ and $|\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|$ do not commute, (7) may be more than 1 or less than 0, because (7) is not a (conditional) probability. We will encounter such a situation in the next section.

The above discussion is straightforwardly applied to other observables such as $\hat{A}=\sum_i a_i\hat{A}_i$. Thus, it is obvious that the right-hand side of (2) is not sum of expectation values of $\hat{A}$ for $|\Phi\rangle$ when $|\psi_j\rangle$ is found in $|\Phi\rangle$, if $\hat{\Psi}_j$ and $\hat{A}$ do not commute. Then, we should not regard the weak value $\langle\hat{A}\rangle_{\psi_j\Phi}$ as a conditional expectation value of $\hat{A}$ for $|\Phi\rangle$ when $|\psi_j\rangle$ is found in $|\Phi\rangle$.

Then, what are weak values? As written by Aharonov et al.[19],

$$|\langle\hat{A}_i\rangle_{\psi_j,\Phi}|^2=\frac{\Pr(a_i|\psi_j)\Pr(a_i|\Phi)}{\Pr(\psi_j|\Phi)}. \tag{8}$$

The denominator of the right-hand side does not depend on a_i, so that $|\langle\hat{A}_i\rangle_{\psi_j,\Phi}|^2$ relatively gives product of two independent probabilities $\Pr(a_i|\psi_j)$ and $\Pr(a_i|\Phi)$. More generally,

$$|\langle\hat{A}\rangle_{\psi_j,\Phi}|^2=\frac{\langle\Phi|\hat{A}\hat{\Psi}_j\hat{A}|\Phi\rangle}{\Pr(\psi_j|\Phi)}, \tag{9}$$

though what quantity corresponds to a hermitian operator $\hat{A}\hat{\Psi}_j\hat{A}$ is not known. Thus, square of a weak value does not give, even if contextually, two simultaneously-measured expectation values of noncommuting observables, but is a conditional expectation value of *one* observable.

Before applying the discussion in this section to Hardy's paradox, we comment on commutativity of operators in practical experiments. Because error is not avoidable there, *commuting* and *noncommuting* should be continuously connected. If two projection operators $\hat{X}_i\equiv|x_i\rangle\langle x_i|$ and $\hat{Y}_j\equiv|y_j\rangle\langle y_j|$ have a very little commutator $[\hat{Y}_j,\hat{X}_i]$, we may regard them as *commuting* and $\hat{Y}_j\hat{X}_i$ has a corresponding proposition. More rigorously, because of an identity

$$\hat{Y}_j\hat{X}_i\hat{Y}_j\hat{X}_i=(1-\langle[\hat{Y}_j,\hat{X}_i]\rangle_{y_jx_i})\hat{Y}_j\hat{X}_i, \tag{10}$$

$\hat{Y}_j\hat{X}_i$ can be regarded as a projection operator and $\langle\Xi|\hat{Y}_j\hat{X}_i|\Xi\rangle$ as the probability of a proposition

$Y(y_j) \wedge X(x_i)$ for a state $|\Xi\rangle$, if $|\langle[\hat{Y}_j, \hat{X}_i]\rangle_{y_j x_i}|$ is smaller than its relative error. For $\hat{X} \equiv \sum_i x_i \hat{X}_i$, $\langle\Xi|\hat{Y}_j\hat{X}|\Xi\rangle$ can be interpreted as an expectation value if $\sum_i \langle\Xi|\hat{Y}_j\hat{X}_i|\Xi\rangle a_i \langle[\hat{Y}_j, \hat{X}_i]\rangle_{y_j x_i}$ is smaller than its absolute error.

3 Hardy's paradox

Recently, counter-factual statements on Hardy's paradox was interpreted in terms of weak values[10] and they were actually measured[11][12][13] by weak measurement. We examine them based on the discussion in the previous section.

A device composed of an electron Mach-Zehnder interferrometer (MZI^-) and that of positrons (MZI^+) is examined. There is a domain(OL) where both of MZIs overlap. We assume pair annihilation must occur if an electron(e^-) and a positron(e^+) exist simultaneously in OL. The length between two beam-splitters $\mathrm{BS1}^{-(+)}$ and $\mathrm{BS2}^{-(+)}$ is adjusted so as to let e^- (e^+) detected by a detector $\mathrm{C}^{-(+)}$ without exception in a solo $\mathrm{MZI}^{-(+)}$ experiment. Conversely, detection by another detector $\mathrm{D}^{-(+)}$ implies that obstacles exist on either path.

Considered is a case where pair annihilation does not occur and e^- and e^+ are detected by D^- and D^+, respectively. The initial state $|\Phi\rangle$ and the final state $|\Psi\rangle$ are defined as

$$|\Phi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\Big[|O_p, NO_e\rangle + |NO_p, O_e\rangle + |NO_p, NO_e\rangle\Big], \tag{11}$$

$$|\Psi\rangle = \frac{1}{2}\Big[|O_p, O_e\rangle - |O_p, NO_e\rangle - |NO_p, O_e\rangle + |NO_p, NO_e\rangle\Big], \tag{12}$$

where O and NO are abbreviations of '*Through OL*' and '*Not through OL*', respectively. Then $\big|\langle\Psi|\Phi\rangle\big|^2 = \frac{1}{12}$ by ordinary quantum mechanical calculation. On the other hand, weak values are

$$\langle\hat{N}^{+,-}_{O,O}\rangle_{\Psi,\Phi} = 0, \tag{13}$$

$$\langle\hat{N}^{+,-}_{O,NO}\rangle_{\Psi,\Phi} = \langle\hat{N}^{+,-}_{NO,O}\rangle_{\Psi,\Phi} = 1, \tag{14}$$

$$\langle\hat{N}^{+,-}_{NO,NO}\rangle_{\Psi,\Phi} = -1, \tag{15}$$

$$\langle\hat{N}^{\pm}_{O}\rangle_{\Psi,\Phi} = 1, \tag{16}$$

$$\langle\hat{N}^{\pm}_{NO}\rangle_{\Psi,\Phi} = 0, \tag{17}$$

where

$$\hat{N}^{+,-}_{O(NO),O(NO)} = |O(NO)_p, O(NO)_e\rangle \otimes\langle O(NO)_p, O(NO)_e|, \tag{18}$$

$$\hat{N}^{+}_{O(NO)} = \hat{N}^{+,-}_{O(NO),O} + \hat{N}^{+,-}_{O(NO),NO}, \tag{19}$$

$$\hat{N}^{-}_{O(NO)} = \hat{N}^{+,-}_{O,O(NO)} + \hat{N}^{+,-}_{NO,O(NO)}. \tag{20}$$

As easily checked, any two of $\hat{\Psi} \equiv |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|$, $\hat{\Phi} \equiv |\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|$ and one of the number operators defined in (18) $\sim$ (20) do not commute. For example, though $\langle\Phi|[\hat{\Psi}, \hat{N}^{+,-}_{NO,NO}]|\Phi\rangle = \langle\Psi[\hat{\Phi}, \hat{N}^{+,-}_{NO,NO}]|\Psi\rangle = 0$,

$$\hat{\Psi}\hat{N}^{+,-}_{NO,NO}\hat{\Psi}\hat{N}^{+,-}_{NO,NO} = \frac{1}{4}\hat{\Psi}\hat{N}^{+,-}_{NO,NO},$$
$$\hat{\Phi}\hat{N}^{+,-}_{NO,NO}\hat{\Phi}\hat{N}^{+,-}_{NO,NO} = \frac{1}{3}\hat{\Phi}\hat{N}^{+,-}_{NO,NO}. \tag{21}$$

Therefore $\langle\hat{N}^{+,-}_{NO,NO}\rangle_{\Psi,\Phi}$ can not be regarded as a conditional probability of finding both e^- and e^+ on NOs between the pre-selected state $|\Phi\rangle$ and the post-selected state $|\Psi\rangle$. Discussions on $\hat{N}^{+,-}_{O,NO}$, $\hat{N}^{+,-}_{NO,O}$ and $\hat{N}^{+,-}_{O,O}$ are almost the same. Based on (8), (13) $\sim$ (15) just mean

$$\begin{aligned}&\Pr(N^{+,-}_{O,O}|\Psi)\Pr(N^{+,-}_{O,O}|\Phi)\\ &:\Pr(N^{+,-}_{O,NO}|\Psi)\Pr(N^{+,-}_{O,NO}|\Phi)\\ &:\Pr(N^{+,-}_{NO,O}|\Psi)\Pr(N^{+,-}_{NO,O}|\Phi)\\ &:\Pr(N^{+,-}_{NO,NO}|\Psi)\Pr(N^{+,-}_{NO,NO}|\Phi)\\ &= 0:1:1:1.\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

Based on (9),

$$|\langle\hat{N}^{\pm}_{O(NO)}\rangle_{\Psi,\Phi}|^2 = \frac{\langle\Phi|\hat{N}^{\pm}_{O(NO)}\hat{\Psi}\hat{N}^{\pm}_{O(NO)}|\Phi\rangle}{\Pr(\Psi|\Phi)}, \tag{23}$$

though what quantity corresponds to the hermitian operator $\hat{N}^{\pm}_{O(NO)}\hat{\Psi}\hat{N}^{\pm}_{O(NO)}$ is not known. Whichever

operator is used, we, in terms of the weak values (13) $\sim$ (17), have no right to evaluate the validity of the counter-factual statement " e^- must pass through OL so that e^+ is detected by D^+ and vice versa. Nevertheless, both e^- and e^+ can not simultaneously pass through OL, because they must annihilate together if they encounter." Only what we have known by means of the weak values (13) $\sim$ (17) is (22). We can interpret the weak values in Three-box paradox[20][21][22] similarly.

Then, what have the experiments for Hardy's paradox shown? It has been ascertained that the weak values predicted by Aharonov et al. can be measured by weak measurement. This fact, however, add nothing to interpretation of the weak values. Rather, we should say that the validity of the counter-factual statements has not been evaluated by weak measurement. On the other hand, these experiments are regarded as concrete methods of measuring quantities which correspond to hermitian operators on finite dimensional Hilbert space such as $\hat{A}\hat{\Psi}\hat{A}$, which were theoretically proven to be measurable in [23].

4 conclusion

In this paper we studied weak values and weak measurement from a quantum-logical viewpoint. We examined the validity of counter-factual interpretation of Hardy's paradox in terms of weak values. Then, we have concluded that we can not evaluate it. Moreover, a value measured by weak measurement was shown to correspond to a single hermitian operator. Though we never deny potential of weak measurement, we should, with regret, say that weak values and weak measurement as a method of measuring weak values are not beyond ordinary quantum theory, at least under the present conditions.

References

[1] Y. Aharonov, D. Z. Albert and L. Vaidman, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **60**, 1351 (1988)

[2] Y. Aharonov and L. Vaidman, *Phys. Rev. A* **41**, 11 (1990)

[3] Y. Aharonov and A. Botero, *Phys. Rev. A* **72**, 052111 (2005)

[4] J. von Neumann, "Die Mathematische Grundlagen der Quantenmechanik," Springer Verlag, Verlin, 1932

[5] A. Hosoya and M. Koga, *J. Phys. A* **44**, 415303 (2011)

[6] C Tresser, *Eur. Phys. J.* **D58**, 385 (2010)

[7] J. S. Bell, *Physics* **1**, 195 (1964)

[8] A. Hosoya and Y. Shikano, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **43**, 385307 (2010)

[9] L. Hardy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **68**, 2981 (1992)

[10] Y. Aharonov, A. Botero, S. Popescu, B. Reznik and J. Tollaksen, *Phys. Lett.* **301**, 130 (2002)

[11] W. T. M. Irvine, J. F. Hodelin, C. Simon and D. Bouwmeester, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 030401 (2005)

[12] J. S. Lundeen and A. M. Steinberg, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 020404 (2009)

[13] K. Yokota, T, Yamamoto, M. Koashi and N. Imoto, *New J. Phys.* **11**, 033011 (2009)

[14] A. J. Leggett, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **62**, 2325 (1989)

[15] I. M. Duck, P. M. Stevenson and E. C. G. Sudarshan, *Phys. Rev. D* **40**, 2112 (1989)

[16] J. Dressel and A. N. Jordan, *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 012107 (2012)

[17] K. Svozil, "Quantum Logic," Springer-Verlag, Singapore City (1998)

[18] S. Maeda, "Lattice Theory and Quantum Logic," Maki-Shoten, Tokyo (1980)

[19] Y. Aharonov, P. G. Bergmann and J. L. Lebowitz, *Phys. Rev.* **134**, B1430 (1964)

[20] Y. Aharonov and L. Vaidman, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **24**, 2315 (1991)

[21] L. Vaidman, *Found. Phys.* **26**, 895 (1996)

[22] K. J. Resch, J. S. Lundeen and A. M. Steinberg, *Phys. Lett. A* **324**, 125 (2004)

[23] R. Swift and R. Wright, *J. Math. Phys.* **21**, 77 (1979)